



PATHOGENICITY EFFICACIES OF BEAUVERIA BASSIANA AND NANO-BEAUVERICIN SOME TOMATO SERIOUS PESTS AND THEIR PREDATORS

M. M. Sabbour

Pest and Plant Protection Department, National Research Center, El-Tahrir Street, P.O. Box 1262, Dokki, Cairo, Egypt.

ABSTRACT

The effect of the fungi Beauveria bassiana and Nano- Beauvericin on the target insect pest show that, under laboratory condition the LC50s obtained 65.3x 104 and x 104 conidia/ml for B. tabaci after treated with different concentrations of Beauveria bassiana and nano- Beauvericin respectively. The LC50s for M. persicae recorded 51.4 x 104 and x 104 conidia /ml after treated with the corresponding pathogen.

Under field condition in El Esraa (Nobarya) the data obtained detect tat, the M. persicae significantly decreased to 8±9.6, 18±9.1and 25±9.6 individuals after post applications of Nano- Beauvericin treatments after 50, 90 and 120 days. When B. tabaci treated with Beauveria bassianathe individuals significantly decreased to 33±9.4, 38±6.4, and 47±8.2individuals as compared to 49±1.4, 79±4.9, 91±5.7 and individuals in the control after20, 50, 90 and 120 days respectively. El-Kassaseen (Ismailia) governorate, both of the target insect pests significantly decreased.

The experiments in the field showed that, in two governorates, the tomato infestation with B. tabaci or M. psicae significantly decreased after treatments by Beauveria bassianaand nano- Beauvericin as compared to control plants.

KEY WORDS: Bemisia tabaci, whitefly, aphids, bioinsecticide toxin, tomatoes, Beauvericin , nano,Coccinella undecimpunctata.

INTRODUCTION

Tomatoes plants (*Lycopersicon esculentum*) among the highly important crop in all words and in Egypt. Tomatoes crops are infested with very important dangerous insects. The most harmful insect pests are the green peach aphid, *Myzus persicae*, and whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci*. These pests causes many viruses to the plants and causing great infestation and harmful disease to the leaves and fruits, also transfer the virus diseases (Namba and Sylvester 1981; Berry 1998; Filoto et al. 2004). The chemical pesticides, causing a pollution to the environment and causing a reduction in the beneficial insects. Also, they developing the insecticidal resistance among the insect pests and then, consequently, causes an inevitable outbreak (Lowery and Sears 1981). lately, many agriculture studies have favor to use of many microbial agents as a biological agents alternate. Opposite to the other microbial pesticides, bacteria, fungi which cause a successfully controlled against many insect pests (Sabbour and Shadia Abd El-Aziz 2002; Sabbour and Sahab 2005, 2007; Thungarabeab and Tongma 2007; Sahab and Sabbour 2011). The two entomopathogenic fungi, *Nomuraea rileyi* and *Isaria fumosorosea*, demonstrate a very higher pathogenicity against aphids and whiteflies (Espinol et al. 2008). The entomopathogenic fungus *N. rileyi*, decrease the host discriminatory infections against the lepidopterous larvae (Ignoffo et al. 1976). Shanthakumar et al. (2010) recorded that the entomopathogenic fungi *N. rileyi*, make a reductions to many pest insect. In this manner, James and Lighthart (1994) recorded that entomopathogenic fungi *Beauveria bassiana* infect many insects among the Coccinella. Farag (2008), recorded that entomopathogenic fungi *B. bassiana* could to infect *C. undecimpunctata* when sprayed at higher concentration.

The aim of our study to determine the efficacy of *Beauvericin* and its toxin Nano-*Beauveria bassiana* against (*M. persicae* and *B. tabaci*) under laboratory and field conditions and on predator *C. undecimpunctata*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Insect cultures

The target insects of Whitefly *B. tabaci* and *M. persicae* were reared under laboratory conditions 26±2°C and 65±5% RH on a potted tomato plants inside cylinder glass cages (16 cm in diameter x 45 cm in height. The cages were covered with muslin.

The Predator culture of *C. undecimpunctata*, were collected from tomato field which infested with aphid from, Giza governorate, Egypt. Glass jars (25) held 15 adults each. The jars were supplied with fresh duranta leaves infested with aphids for feeding. They were covered with muslin cloth which was held in position with rubber bands. Food was renewed every other day. The experiment investigated every day in order to count the eggs. The eggs were collected and then transferred to a Petri dishes (20 cm diameter) till hatching. The early new larvae counted and then transferred to a plastic jars till the larvae reached (2nd nymphal instar).

The jars contained and definite amount of eggs. Unused nymphs were left in 2 l glass jars (5/each) with small duranta branches carrying different stages of

aphids, till maturation.

Source and production of fungi The fungi *Beauveria bassiana*and Nano-*Beauvericin* were kindly obtained from Dr. Alain Vey (Prof.), Mycology Unit, Pasteur Institute, France, and they produce by the team in the Microbiology Department, National Research Centre, Cairo, Egypt. They were primarily purified by using the mono-spore technique. Then, the fungi were propagated in Petri dishes (9 cm) on Potato Dextrose Agar medium (PDA) enriched with 1% peptone, 4% glucose, and 0.2% yeast extract and incubated at 26°C. Seven-day-old cultures with well developed conidia, were harvested by washing with 10 ml sterilized water. Then 3 drops of Tween-80 were added to 100 ml with water. It was used as stock suspension and kept refrigerated at 4°C. From this stock, dilutions with water were adjusted at the needed proposed concentrations. Large amounts of conidiospores, if needed, were produced by culturing the fungus on liquid medium in 1 l cell-culture glass bottles according to Rombach et al. (1988) (modified by El-Husseini et al. 2004).

Laboratory tests

The target insect pests n treated with entomopathogenic fungi *Beauveria bassiana* and the toxin Nano- *Beauvericin* at the concentrations ranged between 1×10^6 to 1×10^8 conidia/ml. These concentrations were prepared by a dilutions by 1–10 fold from the main prepared culture tank and then used on the target insect pests *B. tabaci* and *M. persicae* at the 3rd nymphal instars. A fresh tomato leaves were sprayed with the last entomopathogenic fungi (3 shots as sprays/leaf) (Matter et al. 1993), then they will left to dry and then they put inside a plastic jars (one/each). Then, a twenty five nymphs of either species were placed on each leaf. The experiment replicated five times. The experiment carried out at 26±2°C and 65±5% RH. Each jar incubated at 25°C. The percentages of mortality were calculated after seven days and corrected according to Abbott, (1925), while LC50 was calculated through probit analysis according to Finney (1964).

Treatments of the predator One-day-old adults and 2nd instar nymphs of *C. undecimpunctata* were used for the evaluation of the pathogenicity and efficacy of *Beauveria bassiana* and toxin Nano- *Beauvericin*.

The methods used:

A – Spray technique to evaluate contact effect.

B – Feeding technique in order to determine the oral toxicity, which required by meant there was no choice (there was exposure to those prey treated only), or free-choice which meant there was exposure to both infected and uninfected prey. This was done to see whether the predator had the ability to recognize infected from uninfected prey.

A – Spray technique There were 20 predators of one-day-old adults or one day-old 2nd nymphal stage predators per group. Each group was placed in a petri dish (25 cm diameter) and sprayed with the *Beauveria bassiana*or Nano-*Beauvericin* a concentration of 1×10^8 (Matter et al. 1993). The shots were directed at the insects at a 15 cm distance. Then, make a tweezers to take the

insects were to plastic jars (5 cm diameter and 15 cm height). The jars had a small water moistened filter paper and an aphid infested tomato plant leaf.

B – required and free-choice feeding techniques Groups of twenty individuals of either adults or 2nd instar nymphs per group were exposed to either a required contaminated diet (*Beauveria bassiana* or Nano- *Beauvericin* treated aphids), or selectively to entomopathogenic fungi treated and untreated aphids, for 24 h. In the case of the free-choice feeding, five groups were used/pathogen/predator stage. The predator nymphs were starved for 4 and 6 hours for nymphs and the predator adults were starved for 6 h. Then, each group was introduced in the middle of 1 jar in which had been placed two branches of tafla carrying ample amounts of the pests. One branch was previously sprayed with the fungus, while the other branch was sprayed with water only. The two branches were placed on both sides of the glass jar, facing each other, to allow the predator individuals free choice to feed on either the treated or untreated aphids. Five glass jars (replicates) were used/ each pathogen. Regarding the required feeding, the same number of predators in each of the 5 glass jars were used as mentioned above, but these predators were offered only treated aphids. In both trials, the exposure period was 24 h. Then, the predators from all the treatments as well as the control, were transferred individually to plastic cups, offered untreated aphids, and checked daily for 14 days.

Field experiments

The field experiments were made against the target insect pests in two places field . Each place area has different climatic and soil factors. These two areas were: (Nobarya region) with a dry climatic weather and the sandy soil, the other place in (Ismailia) which have a wet climatic weather and have a clay soil. Tomato plants (Var. GS12) were planted in the 1st of April in an area measure about 2,400 m², divided into twelve plots of two hundreds m² for each plot. About 4 plots were applied with each pathogen, while 4 plots for the controls (untreated). *Beauveria bassiana* and Nano- *Beauvericin* were applied at 1×10^8 conidia/ml. Treatments were sprayed at a randomized plot at sunset. A ten-litre sprayer was used to spray on the treatments. Three applications were made at one week intervals, at the commencement of the experiment. Twenty plant samples were randomly collected at certain time intervals from each plot and transferred to the laboratory for examination. The average number of each of the tested pests/ sample/plot/treatment was cached at 20, 50, 90 and 120 days after the first application. The number of the infestation of the target insect pests were then calculated in each case. After harvest time, the yield of each pathogen treatment was weighed as kgs/feddan.

Predator Seedlings of tomato plants were sown in rows (Ca 50 cm from each other) in ca half a feddan located in the village of Manawat, Giza governorate. One-month-old plants were found highly infested with the *M. persicae* aphid, and white fly *B. tabaci*. The cultivated land was divided longitudinally into 3 areas (Ca Kirat/each), separated from each other by uncultivated land (4 m width). One area was used for each *M.a* or Nano-*Beauvericin* and the control. Each pathogen was sprayed at the rate of 250 l/feddan, using a high pressure hand held gun. The concentration of the *M.a* or Nano-*Beauvericin* was about (1×10^8) conidia/ml. This concentration had previously achieved more than 80% mortality of both pests, in laboratory experiments. Three applications were made at one week intervals. Then, the *C. undecimpunctata* (nymphs and adults) were carefully scrutinized and counted, on site, in each of the treated and untreated tomato plant plots. The methods used were vision, hand picking, and also, a sweeping net (25 cm diameter) was used. The counts were made just before the 1st application, and 1, 2, and 3 weeks after the last application. After each count, the predators were once again placed on their previous location at the corresponding plant site. Fifty tomato shrubs (10 each from 5 rows) per each treated area as well as the control, were arbitrarily chosen for each time interval. The average number of predators/50 plants/time interval was calculated in each case. The increase or decrease in the population density of the predator/50 plants as compared with the control, was calculated according to Henderson and Tilton's (1955) equation, as follows:

where: Ca – population density in the treated area before treatment Cb – population density in the treated area after treatment Ta – population density in the treated before treatment Tb – population density in the treated area after treatment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The effect of the fungi *Beauveria bassiana* and its toxin Nano- *Beauvericin* on the target insect pest show that, under laboratory condition the LC50s obtained 65.3×10^4 and 116.3×10^4 conidia/ml for *B. tabaci* after treated with different concentrations of Nano-*Beauveria bassiana* and nano-*Beauvericin* respectively. The LC50s for *M. persicae* recorded 51.4×10^4 and 122.7×10^4 conidia /ml after treated with the corresponding pathogen (Table 1).

Table 2 show that under field condition in (Nobarya) the data obtained detect that, the *M. persicae* significantly decreased to 7 ± 5.6 , 15 ± 9.6 and 28 ± 9.1 individuals after post applications of Nano-*Beauveria bassiana* treatments after 50, 90 and 120 days. When *B. tabaci* treated with *Beauveria bassiana* the individuals significantly decreased to 33 ± 9.4 , 38 ± 6.4 , 41 ± 6.8 and 49 ± 6.9 individuals as compared to 49 ± 1.4 , 89 ± 5.4 , 91 ± 5.7 and 191 ± 5.2 individuals in the control after 20, 50, 90 and 120 days respectively. (Ismailia) governorate, both of the target insect

pests significantly decreased (Table 2).

Experiments which made inside the field in (Nobarya) and (Ismailia), show that, the infestation percentages of *B. tabaci* or *M. persicae* were significantly decreased in plots which treated with *Beauveria bassiana* or nano-*Beauvericin*, as compared to control. Although the infestations of both of the two target insect pastes were decreased after bot pathogen treatments. (Table 2). Effects of *Beauveria bassiana* and Nano-*Beauvericin* *C. undecimpunctata* showed no effect . Under the laboratory investigations results showed that the predator *C. undecimpunctata* is less susceptible to all both of the two pathogens (Table 3). At all, predators adults showed greater resistance to both pathogen treatments. But the predator nymphs affect more than the adults. Under Laboratory conditions , results obtained that the percentages of the mortality in predators adults after *Beauveria bassiana* treatments spray was about 0.62 times which show a more in the mortality than percentages obtained from Nano-*Beauveria bassiana* treatments. (Table 4). Treatments of *Beauvericin*, showed a highly reductions in the population densities (63.33 and 43.99%) were estimated in the 1st and 2nd weeks after the last application, respectively.

At the end of the experiments, the weight of tomatoes showed an significantly increase to 2891 ± 34.31 and 2921 ± 34.31 Kg/feddan in plots treated with Nano-*Beauveria bassiana* and *Beauveria bassiana* respectively as compared to 1989 ± 34.31 Kg/feddan in the control in (Nobarya) (Table4). In (Ismailia) the weight of tomatoes crops significantly increased to 2989 ± 75.32 and 2509 ± 29.83 Kg/feddan in plots treated with Nano-*Beauveria bassiana* and *Beauvericin*, respectively as compared to 1909 ± 34.31 81Kg/feddan in the control.

The same obtained agree with Sabbour and Shadia Abd El-Aziz (2002 and 2010). Our results agree with Abdel-Rahman and Abdel-Mallek (2001), AbdelRahman (2001) and Abdel-Rahman and Abdel-Mallek (2001), Abdel-Rahman et al. (2004, 2006) who reported that, the bioinsecticide control all of the cereal aphids especially the entomopathogenic fungi. The same finding obtained by, Sabbour and Sahab (2005, 2007), Sahab and Sabbour (2011) found that fungi control many of insect infested the cabbage and tomato crops under laboratory and field conditions. Our results showed that the predator *C. undecimpunctata* not affected with the tested fungi M.a, and Detruxin. Goettel et al. (1990) reported that the fungi commercial formulations controlled aphids and thrips with low in the influence impact on non-target insects. The same findings with Todorova et al. (1994), who recorderd that of *B. bassiana* different strains cause an effects on the two predatory insects due to the host response of the insects. Poprawski et al. (1998) found that *Serangium parcestosorum* (Coccinellidae) had lower survival potential when sprayed with *B. bassiana* fungus than when sprayed with *P. fumosoroseus* fungus. Shanthakumar et al. (2010) considered that despite the great virulence of *Beauvericin* against *S. littura*, the pathogen proved reasonably safe for *T. chilonis*. *Beauvericin* did not cause reduction in the parasite percentages of *T. chilonis*. The present results also indicated that the predator, *C. undecimpunctata*, particularly the adult predators, can distinguish between fungus-infected prey and non-infected prey. *C. undecimpunctata* will almost always avoid the treated prey, especially if given free-choice feeding. This, however, was more pronounced in the case of Detruxin than *Beauveria bassiana*. This phenomenon observed in our investigations was also noted by many other authors. It was mentioned that predators, when given free choice to feed on fungus – treated or untreated aphids, predation on the infected prey was less than predation on the uninfected ones (Baverstock et al. 2007). Also, Roy et al. (2010) and Goettel et al. (1990) proved that *C. septempunctata* adults avoid contact with leaf and soil surfaces innoculated with *B. bassiana* fungus and mycosed cadavers. The predator was more often positioned away from mycosad cadaver than from uninfected ones. Nevertheless, some researches indicated several adverse effects of some entomopathogenic fungi against some natural enemies. Haseeb and Murad (1997) and Delete et al. (1995) consider *C. septempunctata* to be somewhat susceptible to *B. bassiana*. While, Farag (2008) consider that some entomopathogenic formulations of *B. bassiana* have deleterious effects on *C. undecimpunctata* if applied at high concentration levels. The various views about the safety of entomopathogenic fungi stated by many different authors, might be due to the relative efficacy of the fungus or its isolates on pests which exhibit different susceptibilities, bionomics, and characters. The various views may also be due to the types of assessment and application rates. The same results obtained by (Sabbour and Hany a&b, (2007), Matr and Sabbour 2013,Sabbour, 2007 who found tat the usages of the bio insecticides not affect on the parasites and predators. Also Sabbour and Nayera 2016, a&b controlled the locust and grasshopper with bio pesticides. Sabbour and Singer 2016, a&b control insects by *Beauveria bassiana* and nano-*Beauvericin*. Sabbour and Abd El Raheem 2016, Sabbour and Hussein 2016 found that bioinsecticides not pollute the environments.

Acknowledgements. This research was supported by project, TITLED, BIOLOGICAL CONTROL OF SOME GREENHOUSE TOMATO INSECT PESTS

Table 1: The entomopathogenic fungi effect and its toxin against *B. tabaci* and *M. persicae* under laboratory.

Insects	Treatments	LC50	95% confidence limits
<i>B. tabaci</i>	Nano-Beauvericin	65.3×10^4	65.3–120
	B.bassiana	116.3×10^4	90–135
<i>M. persicae</i>	Nano-Beauvericin	51.4×10^4	61–139
	Beauvericin	122.7×10^4	89–159

Table 2. *B. tabaci* and *M. persicae* infestation after treatment with the pathogen under field conditions.

Treatments	Days after 1 st application	(Nobarya)		(Ismailia)	
		<i>B. tabaci</i>	<i>M. persicae</i>	<i>B. tabaci</i>	<i>M. persicae</i>
Control	20	55±1.1	54±1.6	55±1.1	64±3.5
	50	77±1.9	72±9.1	89±5.4	187±3.2
	90	87±9.6	97±3.3	91±5.7	198±9.7
	120	163±4.8	150±7.0	191±5.2	165±6.7
B.bassiana	20	33±9.4	13±4.7	12±5.3	9±3.9
	50	38±6.4	18±2.8	35±6.6	27±4.3
	90	41±6.8	33±4.2	43±4.2	36±4.1
	120	49±6.9	41±7.1	53±6.9	47±7.2
Nano-Beauvericin	20	0	0	4±0.3	5±0.2
	50	11±1.6	8±9.6	12±1.5	10±1.7
	90	22±2.8	18±9.1	20±4.9	21±3.4
	120	30±8.5	28±9.1	35±5.8	36±5.7
F test		25.3		24.7	
Lsd 5%		11.2		13.5	

Table(3): effect of the entomopathogenic fungi and its toxin on developmental stages of *C. Undecimpunctata*.

Pathogen	percentages of th mortality of infected insects					
	Adults		Nymphs			
	Type of treatment					
	Direct spray	Ingestion treated diet	Direct spray	Ingestion treated diet	Obligatory	Selection
B. bassiana	19.20 ± 7.61	18.4 ± 2.71	7.2 ± 1.5	28.6 ± 2.19	29.6 ± 3.49	12.8 ± 1.96
Nano-Beauvericin	31.2 ± 4.45	33.6 ± 4.49	24.8 ± 2.82	41.6 ± 3.71	39.2 ± 4.45	22.4 ± 2.40
F test			28.9		10.9	
Lsd 5%						

Table (4): Average number of *C. undecimpunctata* (all stages) / 50 tomatoes shrubs after successive post fungal application period.

post application (Weeks)	Treatments				
	Average number of <i>C. undecimpunctata</i> ± SE				
Just before 1 st . Application	Control	B. bassiana	Nano-Beauvericin	% increase(+) or decrease (-)**	
	18.75 ± 3.36	21.00 ± 2.55	20.00 ± 1,58	Destruxin	M.anisopliae
One week after the last last Application	21.25 ± 1.70	16.11 ± 2.15	7.3 ± 1.71	-36.22	-69.09
	19.20 ± 1.50	17.11 ± 1.16	11.5 ± 0.96	-19.81	-43.99
Three weeks after the last last Application	17.00 ± 1.12	20.15 ± 8.65	14.20 ± 8.93	+6.36	-21.42

Percentages of increase or decrease in *C. undecimpunctata* population denesity as compared with the check according to Hendrson and Tilton (1955).

Table (5): Tomatoes weight after pathogens tested on *B. tabaci* and *M. persicae* in.

	(Nobarya)	(Ismailia)
Treatments	Weight tomatoes (Kg/feddan)	Weight tomatoes (Kg/feddan)
Control	1989± 34.31	1909± 34.31
Nano-Beauvericin	2891± 34.31	2989±75.32
B. bassiana	2407± 12.17	2509±29.83
F values	31.02	32.43
LSD 5%	81	82

REFERENCES

- Abbott, WS. 1925. A method of computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 18: 265-267
- Abdel-Rahman, MAA. 2001. Seasonal prevalence of entomopathogenic fungi attacking cereal aphids infesting wheat in southern Egypt. *Inter. Symposium. Agric. Agadir-Morocco* 7-10: 381-389.
- Abdel-Rahman, MAA, Abdel-Mallek, AY. 2001. Paramilitary records on entomopathogenic fungi attacking cereal aphids infesting wheat plants in southern Egypt. First Conference for safe Alternatives to pesticides for pest managements, Assiut : 183-190.
- Abdel-Rahman MAA., Abdel-Mallek AY., Omar SA, Hamam AH. 2004. Natural occurrence of entomopathogenic fungi on cereal aphids at Assiut A comparison study between field and laboratory observations. *Egypt. J. Boil. Sci.* 14: 107-112.
- Abdel-Rahman MA, Ahmed AY, Abdel-Mallek G, Hamam, HA. 2006. A comparative abundance of entomopathogenic fungi of cereal aphids in Assiut Egypt. *J. Boil. Pest cont.* 16: 39-43.
- Avery, BP, Jane Faull and Monique S.J. Simmonds 2004. Effect of different photoperiods on the growth, infectivity and colonization of Trinidadian strain of Paecilomyces fumosoroseus on the green housefly, *Trialeurodes vaporariorum*, using glass slide bioassay. *J. Insect Sci.* 2004, 4:38
- Baverstock J, Roy HE, Brown PM, Ware RL, Majorus M.E.E, Pell JK. 2007. The invasive Coccinellid, *Harmonia axyridis* as an intra-guild predator of aphid specific fungus, *Pandora neopaphidis*. 40 th Ann. Meeting of soc. For Invertebrate. Pathol., Quebec city, Canada 12-15 Aug 23, 2007.
- Berry, RE. (1998). Insects and mites of economic importance in the specific northwest 2nd Ed. Osu Bookstore, Inc. Corvallis, OR, USA 221 PP.
- Chang L, Tang RFH. 1988. Potential application of the entomopathogenic fungus *Nomuraea rileyi* for controlling *Heliothis armigera*. *Entomologia* 88(1): 25-30.
- Delete KM, Grace J K, Tom CHM. 1995. Potential use of pathogenic fungi in baits to control the Formosan subterranean termites (*Isop*: *Rhinotermes* sp.). *J. Appl. Ent.* 119: 6, 429-433.
- El-Husseini MM, Shahira S, Marie AM, Amal A.El-Zoghby, Sahar S.Ali, Naglaa,AM,Omar; E.A.Agam; H.E.Abou Bakr; M.S.Nada; SherinTamer; Hannah,M.Kamal and A.M. Ibrahim (2004). Isolation, Production and use of entomopathogenic fungi for controlling the sugar beet insect pests in Egypt. *Egypt. J. Biol.Pest Control.* 14(1):265-275.
- Espinel C, Lissette T, Erika G, Laura VL, Alba MC. 2008. Preformulados para control de la mosca blanca *Bemisia tabaci* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) en condiciones de laboratorio. *Rev. Colomb. Entomol.* vol.34 no.1 Bogotá,Jun./June 2008
- Farag NA.2008. Impact of entomopathogenic fungi on the aphid, *Brevicoryne brassicae* L. And its associated predator, *Coccinella undecimpunctata* L. *Egyptian J. Biol. Pest Control* 18: (2)297-301.
- Filotos, MG, Wright SP and Sanderson, JP. (2004). Selection of entomopathogenic fungi for microbial control of aphid pests in US greenhouses. *Society of Invertebr. Pathol. Proc. Annual Meeting*, 37-97.
- Finney DJ. 1964. Probit analysis. 2nd Ed., Cambridge. Univ. Press. England.
- Goettel M, Poprawski, TG, Vandenberg JD, Li Z. and Roberts DW. 1990. Safety to nontarget invertebrates of fungal biocontrol agents. In Lord, M.; Lacey, L.A. and Davidson, E.W. Eds. Safety of microbial insecticides. CRC Press PP. 209-231
- Hafez M, Salama. HS, Abou El-Ala R, Ragaei M. 1993. Developmental stages of *Agrotis ipsilon* (Hufn.) (Lep.: Noctuidae) as affected by *Bacillus thuringiensis* . *J. Appl. Ent.* 115: 5, 466-476.
- Haseeb M, Murad H.1997. Susceptibility of the predator *Coccinell septempunctata* to the entomopathogenic fungus Beauveria Bassiana. *Ann. Plant. Prot. Sci.* 5(2): 188-209.
- Hendrson CF, Tilton EW. (1955). Test with acaricides against the brown wheat mite. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 48: 157-161.
- Ignoffo CM, Marston NL, Puttler B, Bell JV. 1976. Natural and induced epizootic of *Nomurea rileyi* in soybean. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* .. 27: 191-194.
- James R R, Light hart B. 1994. Susceptibility of ladybeetle (Coleoptera, Coccinellidae) to four entomogenous fungi. *Environ. Ent.* 23: 190-192.
- Lowery DT, Sears MK.1981. Effect of exposure of green peach aphid to azinphosmethyl. *J. Econ. Ent.* 79: 1534-1538.
- Matter M M, Shahira S. Marei, Moawad SM, Souad El-Gengaihi. (1993). The reaction of *Aphis gossypii* and its predator, *Coccinella undecimpunctata* to some plant extracts. *Bull. Fac. Agric. Cairo.* 44: 413-432.
- Mesbah II, Abou-Attia F, Metwally S, Bassyouni,AM, Shalaby A.2004. Utilization of

biological control agents for controlling some sugar beet insect pests at Kafer El-Sheikh region. Egypt. Egypt. J. Biol. Pest. Cont. 14: 195-199.

25. Namba R, Sylvester ES. 1981. Transmission of cauliflower mosaic viruses by the green peach. J. Econ. Entomol. 74: 546-551.
26. Ormond E L, Thomas A P M, Pell J K, Freeman SN, Ray H E. In press. Avoidance of generalist entomopathogenic fungus by ladybird, *Coccinella septumpunctata*.
27. Peleving, R. And Dempa, S. A. (1997). Virulence of the entomopathogenic fungus, *Metarhizium flavoviride* to nontarget arthropods in Mouratania. Archives for environmental Contamination and toxicity. 32: 69-79.
28. Poprawski TJ, Crisotomo LG, Parker P E. (1998). Infelunce of entomopathogenic fungi on *Serangium parcesetosum* (Col. Coccinellidae) on important predator of whitefly (Hom. Aleyrodidae. Inviron. Ent. 27: 785-795.
29. Rombach MC, Aguda RM, Robert DW. 1988. Production of *Beauveria bassiana* in different liquid media and subsequent conditions mycelium. Entomo., 33:315-234.
30. Roy HE, Freeman SN, Ormond EL, Thomas A P M, Bell JK. (2010). *Coccinella septumpunctata* avoids the generalist entomopathogenic fungus *Beauveria bassiana*. Int. Symp. Ecology of Aphidophaga perugia. Italy. 11: 19-24.
31. Sabbour MM, Shadia Abd El-Aziz. 2002. Efficacy of some botanical oils formulated with microbial agents against the cotton leafworm and greasy cutworm attacking cotton plants. Bull. Ent. Soc. Egypt., 28: 135-151.
32. Sabbour MM, Sahab AF. 2005. Efficacy of some microbial control agents against cabbage pests in Egypt. Pak. J. Biol. Sci. 8: 1351-1356.
33. Sabbour MM, Sahab AF. 2007. Efficacy of some microbial control agents against *Agrotis ipsilon* and *Heliothis armigera* in Egypt. Bull. N. R. C. Egypt.13
34. Sabbour MM, Abdel-Rahman A . 2007. Evaluations of some terpenes and entomopathogenic fungi on three sugar beet insect pests. J. Boil. Pest. Cont. 17:22-29 .
35. Sahab A.F, Sabbour MM. 2011. Virulence of four entomopathogenic fungi on some cotton pests with especial reference to impact of some pesticides, nutritional and environmental factors on fungal growth. Egyp. J. boil pest cont. 21 (1): 61-67.
36. Sabbour MM, Shadia abd el Aziz. 2010. The effect of some microbial control agents and some plant oils against *Bruchidius incarnatus*. J. of plant prot. Res. Vol. 50, No. 1 (2010).
37. Sabbour, M.M , 2007. Evaluations of some entomopathogenic fungi and the predator *Coccinella septempunctata* against cereal aphids in Egypt, 2007. Egypt. Bull. ent. Soc. Egypt. Econ.33: 165-174.
38. Matter, M.M. and M.M. Sabbour, 2013. "Differential efficacies of *Nomuraea rileyi* and *Isaria fumosorosea* on some serious pests and their efficient predator prevailing in tomato fields in Egypt.J. of. Plant Pro. Res.. Vol. 53, No. 2. 103-109. (2013)
39. Sabbour, M. M and Hany, A. 2007a. Controlling of *Bemisia tabaci* by *Verticillium lecanii* and *Paeciliomyces fumosoroseus* in potato field. Egypt. Bull. ent. Soc. Egypt, 33:135-141
40. Sabbour, M. M and Hany, A. 2007b. Evaluations of some entomopathogenic fungi and *Trichogramma evanescens* on the potato tuber moth in the field Egypt. Bull. ent. Soc. Egypt. Egypt. Bull. ent. Sco. Egypt, 33: 115-123
41. Sabbour M.M. Nayera. Y. Solieman. 2016. Control of grasshopper *Hetiracris littoralis* (Orthoptera: Acrididae) by using nano-imidaclorprid in corn fields. International Journal of ChemTech Research Vol.9, No.01 pp 259-266.
42. Sabbour M. M. and S. M. Singer. 2016. Incidence effect by nano spinosad of the invasive tomato leafminer, *Tuta absoluta* Meyrick, (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) under laboratory and field condition . Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Research, 2016, 8(2):829-833.
43. Sabbour M. M. and S. M. Singer. 2016. Observations of the Effect of Two Isolated Nano *Bacillus Thuringiensis* on *Tuta absoluta* Infestation under Laboratory and Field Condition. RJPBCS 7(2) Page No. 1892-1900.
44. Sabbour M.M. Nayera. Y. Solieman. 2016. The efficacy effect of using chitosan and nano-chitosan against *Tuta absoluta* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Research, 2016, 8(3):548-554.
45. Sabbour, Magda and MA Abdel-Raheem.2015. Nano Imidaclorprid efficacy against the desert locust, *Schistocerca gregaria* under laboratory and semi field conditions Der Pharma Chemica, 2016, 8(4):133-136.
46. Sabbour Magdal and Hussein M. M. 2016. Determinations of the effect of using silica gel and nano-silica gel against *Tuta absoluta* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) in tomato fields. Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Research, 2016, 8(4):506-512.
47. Shanthakumar SP, Murali PO, Malarvannan V P, Sudka Nair. 2010. Laboratory evaluation on the potential of entomopathogenic fungus *Nomuraea rileyi* against tobacco caterpillars and its safty to *Trichogramma* spp. J. biopesticides 3 (1 special issue) 132-137. (<http://www.jbiopest.com/users/LW8/eiles/Shanthakumar/3.pdf>).
48. Spreakel B K, Brooks W M. 1975. Artificial dissemination and epizootic initiation of *Nomuraea rileyi* entomogenous fungus of Lepidopterous pests of soybean . J. Econ. Entomol. 18: 847-851.
49. Thungrabeeb, M, Tongma S. 2007. Effect of entomopathogenic fungi, *Beauveria bassiana* and *Metarhizium anisopliae* on nontarget insects. J. KMITL. Sci. Tech. 7(51) Nov. 2007. (www.kmitl.ac.th/ejkmitl/vol7nos1/po2-pdf).
50. Tilton , C.F and Henderson , A.M. (1955) Tests with a caricides against the brown wheat mite. J. Econ. Ent. 48: 157-161.
51. Todorova SI, Cote JL, Martel P, Coderre D. (1994). Hetrogenity of two *Baeuveria bassiana* strains on two coleopteran predators. Entomophaga 39: 159-169.